

REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed December 12, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 19-22 were pending in the Application prior to Office Action mailed December 12, 2007. The Office Action rejected claims 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,503 to Herzig et al. (hereinafter Herzig) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,244 to Swartz et al. (hereinafter Swartz).

II. Summary of Applicants' Response

The present Reply amends claim 19, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 19-22. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

III. Response to Rejections

Claim 19

Claim 19 (as amended) states:

A system, comprising:

- (a) a plurality of input channels;
- (b) a processing device for storing an internal representation of a phrase element which can be predefined, recorded as needed, or synthetically generated on demand; and,
- (c) a scanning device, coupled with the processing device, for reading a first code associated with the phrase element and for reading a second code associated with at least one of the plurality of input channels, wherein the processing device initiates to provide an audible utterance only over the channel associated with said second code while communicating over another channel and being capable of receiving an audible input over the channel.

The Office Action conceded that Herzig does not disclose a plurality of input channels and communicating concurrently on two channels. The Office Action asserted, however, that Swartz taught Claim 19's requirement for a "processing device initiates to provide an audible

utterance over the channel associated with said second code while communicating over another channel and being capable of receiving an audible input over the channel.” However, the example cited by the Office Action (“i.e. verbally communicating on one call while another call is on hold simultaneously”) does not teach the requirement of Claim 19. Communicating on one call while another call is on hold does not teach providing an audible utterance over a second channel while communicating over another channel and being capable of receiving an audible input over the channel. Placing a call on hold does not teach the requirements of Claim 19.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 19 is not obvious in view of the combination of Herzig and Swartz. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection to claim 19 be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Dependent Claims 20-22 depend from Claim 19. For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 19, dependent Claims 20-22 are also patentable. Dependent claims 20-22 add their own features which render them patentable in their own right.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 5, 2008

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/
Thomas K. Plunkett
Reg. No. 57,253

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910